

REMARKS

Claims 11-13 have been canceled. Thus, the claims presently pending are Claims 1-10 and 14-30. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 14, 18, 22, 23 and 27 have been amended, as shown above. These amendments are respectfully submitted to not introduce new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification was objected to due to several informalities. The Applicants have amended the specification, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, to correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to the specification.

II. OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

Claims 17-22 were provisionally rejected because claims 17-18 were missing in the official record. The Applicants have included claims 17-18, above, thereby overcoming the objection to claims 17-22.

Claims 1-6 and 18-20 were objected to due to several informalities. The Applicants have amended the claims, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, to correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to Claims 1-6 and 18-20.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as not being directed to statutory subject matter. The Applicants have canceled Claims 11-13, thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6, 11-16 and 23-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and Claims 17-22 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as including the following non-enabled subject matter: “the discrete cosine transform of the at least one data block.” The Applicants have amended the claims, in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestions, to replace the “non-enabling” language with enabled language, such as “the discrete-cosine-transformed digitized image data of the at least one data block.”

In addition, Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due to the lack of antecedent basis for the recitation of “the identification” in line 10 of claim 7. The Applicants have amended claim 7, in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion, to provide proper antecedent basis in claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections.

V. CONCLUSION

Thus, all grounds of rejection and/or objection are traversed or accommodated, and favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments facilitating allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative indicated below to further prosecution of this application to allowance and issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

RAMAKRISHNA KAKARALA, ET AL.

Dated: 2/15/2005


Holly L. Rudnick
Registration No. 43,065

Garlick, Harrison & Markison, LLP
P.O. Box 670007
Dallas, Texas 75367
(Direct) (214) 387-8097
(Fax) (214) 387-7949
(Email) hrudnick@texaspatents.com